

CANDOUR

The British Views - Letter

To serve as a link between Britons all over the world in protest against the surrender of their world heritage

Vol. XVII, No. 459

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

December, 1966

DOWN THE ZAMBEZI IN EIGHT YEARS

By A. K. CHESTERTON

LET there be no humbug about the meeting on board H.M.S. Tiger and its immediate aftermath. In all human likelihood, despite the fact that Mr. Ian Smith receives a monopoly of the applause, Rhodesia owes its temporary salvation very much less to him than it does to his Government colleagues, and to them perhaps very much less than to the Rhodesian Front. Consider the record.

While it would be foolish to regard latter-day British Prime Ministers as models of veracity, there was a ring of truth in Harold Wilson's reiterated statement, when reporting to the House of Commons, that agreement had been very close. "At one stage," he said, "it was within our grasp." He meant, quite obviously and quite genuinely, that he thought he had Smith hooked, and the strong probability is that but for the Rhodesian Government he would have had Smith landed. It will be recalled that Mr. Smith established long-range contact with members of his Cabinet while the negotiations were still in progress.

NEW SCALE OF VALUES

After the final rejection there came the bitter Wilsonian lament that Mr. Smith had allowed himself to be "pushed around by evil men among his colleagues". That is a pleasant description of men such as the Duke of Montrose (Lord Graham), William Harper, and other Ministers to whom nobody except Harold Wilson has ever thought of attributing the slightest trace of diabolism. In the new scale of values, perhaps, it is wicked to be patriotic and at the same time White. It is the mark of the Beast, maybe, to endeavour to save the innocent people of Rhodesia, Black as well as White, from the unspeakable terrors of Mau Mau, from the frightful atrocities of the Congo and from the kind of death devised for the followers of Alice Lenshina by Wilson's soul-mate, Kenneth Kaunda.

But let me not digress. The "working document" which Ian Smith brought back from Gibraltar was not incubated by the British Government alone, but was produced jointly by the British and Rhodesian negotiators. This fact was not disputed by the Smith regime until four days after the breakdown. What was it, if not a joint document—a unilateral British statement of its final terms? Then why the "hard work" on board H.M.S. Tiger? Indeed, why the holding of the conference at all? The Salisbury denial is a difficult one to credit. That Salisbury was prepared to accept the six lethal British principles had long been apparent, but the

"working document" contained plans for giving effect to them which would surely have immediately turned any stomach less accommodating than that of Ian Smith.

As I predicted to my friends before the Gibraltar meeting, a *sine qua non* of any settlement based on a "return to legality" would be a Smith Government recognition of the Governor in return for the Governor's recognition of the Smith Government. This was duly provided for, except that before the word "government" was inserted the ominous word "interim". But what I did not predict would appear in any *joint* draft, was that the Legislature would be dissolved or that the Governor would be allowed to nominate additional members. Rather than present such a document to his Cabinet, Mr. Smith would have done better to throw it into the Mediterranean and hurl his "advisers" and "drafters" after it.

DUBIOUS BARGAIN

But no. After being closetted for several hours with his Cabinet back in Salisbury the Prime Minister told a cheering crowd that three of the proposals (a modest numbering) were "repugnant". One was the dissolution of Parliament. Another was the Governor's power to appoint five Ministers, including two Africans. But these provisions in embryo were in the "working document". A third was the Governor's control over the armed forces and para-military police. Yet, difficult though it be to credit, this was also provided for by the British and Rhodesian drafters of the document in their reference to the Governor's responsibility, as Commander-in-Chief, for the maintenance of law and order, in the discharge of which he was to be advised by a Council which would include a representative of the British Government. Thus the Rhodesian Government would lose the *de facto* power to govern in return for a dubious and most tentative *de jure* status.

The amazing thing was that with this document of doom in front of them the Cabinet should have spent hours studying the damned thing and even contacted London for the amplification of some of the clauses. Did the Ministers require the British Government to spell out for them in the simplest language that the assertion of the Governor's responsibility for law and order involved their own loss of control over the defence forces and police?

Were some of them wavering until the answer to that final fantastic situation was made clear? If so, then Heaven be all the more loudly praised for the existence

of the Rhodesian Front. Were it not for the knowledge of Rhodesian Front reactions, who can guess how complete the capitulation might have been!

We should bear in mind that only about a week before his meeting with Wilson the Rhodesian Prime Minister at a Press conference began to condition Rhodesian public opinion for the acceptance of some sort of climb-down. "African rule must eventually come," he said. "I am going all out to reach a settlement, whatever happens. . . . As far as the constitution is concerned we are near an agreement (with the British Government). The frills, the trimmings, the mechanics, the return to constitutionality—these are the things where we are far apart and these things are really unimportant. Even on the A Roll Africans will eventually gain control. The record shows that the Africans would not be fit to take

over at the next election—and possibly not for another five years after that."

What a shimmering prospect for White Rhodesians! They are to be called upon to endure a long and harassing economic siege for the rich reward of being sold down the Zambezi in about eight years' time, if not before.

Well, as long as we who are their friends can help them, our help will be unstinted. Many of them know that the present writer, in endeavours on their behalf, has issued warnings which events have not disproved. His warning in the present situation is to support their leaders, but in so doing to cut down to size those whom they have made into gods. Rhodesia has had a very, very narrow escape.

PORTRAIT OF AN ARCH-HUMBUG

THE hideous distempers of this modern age have rarely been more strikingly revealed than they were in two utterances by the Right Honourable Harold Wilson when he spoke to the House of Commons on the Rhodesian issue last month. Referring to a Conservative's description of the crisis as "this unhappy fratricidal conflict" our lovingly disposed Prime Minister said:

"As for the use of the word 'fratricide', I do not think that the 'kith and kin' argument should be based on colour. The whole world is our kith and kin, and the sooner this is recognised by all members the sooner we can reach the right solution in Rhodesia".

The whole world, indeed! That is a very tall order.

We may recollect with affection the claim of St. Francis to his relationship with Brother Flea, but there would be no trace of affection had he put forward the claim as an excuse for ditching his fellow-Christians. In as far as Harold Wilson asserts that the whole world consists of his kith and kin—except, presumably, the Rhodesians whom he has tried to starve into submission—it may be that he, too, should express this attitude by naming some particular species as a symbol of his affinity.

SUITABLE COMBINATION

Brother Flea is too chirpy a fellow to serve this purpose. I suggest instead a combination which might consist of Brother Worm, Brother Scorpion, Brother Mamba (the colour here being suppressed in deference to our New Britons), Brother Hyaena, Brother Virus, Brother Toxin, Brother Cancer and various other Wilsonian relatives who are as much a part of the world as he is, and a damned sight truer to the nature of their own kind than he is to his. What is more, as no distinction is to be allowed within "the kith and kin of the whole world", there would seem to be no reason why these various blood-brothers of the Prime Minister should not be given seats in the United Nations, thereby establishing a true universality of that noble body.

It will be clear to the intelligent reader that I have not quoted Harold Wilson's utterances for the purpose of joining issue with him in this article over his grotesque

mishandling of the Rhodesian question. What I here have in mind is the exposure through analysis of the sheer mental and spiritual degradation, inherent in such language, which is systematically destroying the values of Western Christian civilisation not only by double-talk but by the employment of phrases which, loudly applauded though they may be in the House of Commons, are in the literal sense nonsense—that is to say they are utterly devoid of meaning.

Lest it be thought that I have been unfair to Harold Wilson in extending his concept of a world kith and kin to embrace its non-human components, let me illustrate his absurdity within the narrower context of human society, or rather, since that has no existence in reality, of human societies. His all-embracing fraternal zeal would certainly lead him to greet an inhabitant of the Arctic as Brother Eskimo. It would thus be in line with the Wilsonian principle were he to remove himself and his family to the Arctic Circle, build an igloo and settle down to live in happy harmony with his Eskimo kith and kin. But when it came to observing the Eskimo custom which lays down what hospitality is owed to the overnight guest, would there not be a marked disposition on the part of the Wilsons to demur—more than that, to object so strongly as to lay themselves open to a charge of discrimination, which of course is a crime against humanity?

BROTHER MAU MAU?

There is no difficulty in imagining thousands of analogous situations where the application of the Wilsonian dictum would prove, to say the least, a little trying. Being a freeman of the whole world, there was nothing fifteen or twenty years ago to have prevented Harold Wilson opting to live in Kenya among his Kikuyu kith and kin. Would he have greeted the disaffected as Brother Mau Mau? Would he have been persuaded into the depths of the forest, there to participate in the dreadful obscenity of the oath-taking ceremonies? I feel quite sure the answer is "no". Yet Mau Mau was of the world, the totality of which he claims as his kith and kin! After the *fait accompli*, the Prime Minister perhaps now feels that any divisive emotions he might have entertained in such a contin-

gency are happily bridged by his being able to hail the Mzee, not as the leader to darkness and death, but as Brother Jomo.

So, a few months ago, when he visited his kith and kin of Zambia. It is inconceivable that Prime Minister Wilson knew nothing of the foul and obscene torturing to death, on Kaunda's orders, of members of Alice Lenshina's non-political religious sect. Yet that, too, was now a *fait accompli*: the circumstances had aroused no indignation in the breasts of the Tom Dribergs and the Michael Foots and the other militant "humanitarians" on the Labour back-benches, so that there was no inhibiting factor to prevent Wilson's large-hearted display of kith and kinship as he bounded down the gangway at Lusaka Airport to greet Brother Kaunda with the resounding shout:

"Hullo, Kenneth!"

NOT NICE!

The inhibiting factor so far as Africa was concerned clearly became operative only south of the Zambezi, where women are not done to death by the application of burning faggots to their private parts and where men are not choked by cramming into their mouths their severed genitals.

Tut, tut, Mr. Wilson and his friends will not think it at all nice of me to mention these little details of the sort of thing which goes on in those parts of the world wherein his favourite kith and kin would seem to dwell. Allow me, therefore, to return with all possible speed

to our own as yet still civilized country, where official outrage is inflicted not on the body but on the mind.

Here, in the very place where Harold Wilson claims the whole world as his kith and kin, the border-line beyond which that principle, in theory at least, ceases to operate is a line to be drawn down the centre of the floor of the House of Commons. Eskimos and Kikuyu and Outer Mongolians and the rest are all members of the Wilson brotherhood, but one has only to hear his election fulminations to know that the wicked Tories can never aspire to a place in that exalted kinship. Nor—again in theory—can the wicked capitalists, except of course those who subscribe to Labour Party funds.

There come to mind the lines (I think they were my cousin's):

"Oh, how I love the human race

And hate my next-door neighbour."

For this purpose, needless to say, White Rhodesians rank as next-door neighbours. Which all goes to show Well, what does it go to show? Among many other things, that Harold Wilson is a bloody little humbug.

If there are informed and courageous members of either House or any Party to whom the same description does not apply, let them in these dark and shaming times proclaim the truth in voices which speak out loud and clear.

I greatly fear that the response will not place any unbearable strain on our ear-drums.

A. K. CHESTERTON.

CUT AND THRUST

THE Manchester City Council missed a great opportunity when the Sikh community presented a petition protesting against the regulation which requires bus drivers and conductors to wear uniform peaked caps. What was demanded was the right of Sikhs so employed to wear turbans. Instead of debating the problem the transport committee should have shown its freedom from racial discrimination by at once granting the demand, but at the same time, as uniformity is clearly desirable, it should have issued instructions for peaked caps to be thrown onto the discard and for British busmen also to wear turbans. If they disliked the idea, so much the worse for them, because as all the world knows the one people against whom it is safe, and indeed commendable, to discriminate are the British. As a South London magistrate once said to a dusky delinquent: "If you were an Englishman I would send you to prison."

What perhaps inhibited the Manchester Council was that its Malay busmen and others who favour a similar headwear, while at present tolerating peaked caps, might be so impressed by the surrender to the Sikhs that they would start a furious campaign for the wearing of the fez, while all the other communities began to clamour for their own distinctive headpieces. Africans, not to be outdone, would refuse to go near their vehicles unless crowned with ostrich plumes. Such will be the raw materials for the communal faction-fights of the future, even after the British Isles have been re-named the Afro-Asian Dependencies.

Meanwhile Home Secretary Roy Jenkins, world-famous as the protector of the posteriors of murderous young thugs, is seeking powers to compel people to answer whatever questions the Race Relations Board may care to put to them. One can well imagine resultant dialogues.

Why did you dismiss this man?

On the grounds of incompetence.

In June you dismissed Mr. Joe Shenzi. Why?

On the same grounds.

Last year you sacked Mr. Hamhand Singh. Why?

On the same grounds.

Curious. Do you have views on coloured immigration?

Yes. In my view the saturation point was long ago reached.

Disgusting. Your answers will be sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

The great-hearted Mr. Jenkins is also to push forward his integrationist campaign in other directions.

"I will not rest content," he declared, "until I see much faster progress being made in our public services, and until I see far more coloured policemen, firemen, ambulance men—yes, and coloured magistrates—than we have today". Here let me ask Mr. Jenkins some questions. In what way will his discriminatory intention, amounting to favouritism, lead to faster progress in our public services? Progress towards what end? General inefficiency? Why his yearning for the British public, the most law-abiding in the world and posses-

sing the finest police force in the world, to be marshalled and generally pushed around by coloured policemen? What makes him think that coloured firemen and ambulance drivers would be more efficient than Britishers? As for coloured magistrates, leaving on one side the fact that Britons have kept order among themselves for upwards of a thousand years, one asks what conceivable need there is for coloured magistrates when so many synthetic ones are already sitting on the Bench! If to ask these questions is to commit an offence under the Race Relations Act, then no doubt Mr. Jenkins will have two policemen awaiting me at London Airport when I return home in the Spring—one yellow, perhaps, and the other coal black. With perhaps a third in a turban thrown in for good measure.

* * *

While Mr. Jenkins proclaims his policy of racial discrimination in favour of coloured entrants into the public services, he pursues at the same time a policy of racial discrimination against men and women whose forebears were natives of this Realm. Some blistering comments about the latter policy have been made by Sir Alexander Downer, Australia's High Commissioner, who described the action of the Home Office in turning away many Australians who wish to enter Britain as "ham-handed". As even a columnist of the *Oppenheimer Press* in South Africa was constrained to remark on the subject of these banned Australians: "Well—for one thing—they are the wrong colour."

I think that Sir Alexander's use of the word "ham-handed" was not altogether accurate. It would have been had the Home Office not been aware of the implications of its action. But that is too much to believe. The Home Office knows only too well what it is doing. It is of set intent destroying the British world on the instructions of the internationalists who control both the British and the United States Governments.

* * *

Before the last election the idea was mooted by one of our staunchest supporters that every effort should be made to prevent the return of Conservative candidates and so repel the attempt to take Great Britain into the European Common Market. Our reply, certainly not based on any love of the Conservative Party, was that such a move, being part of the internationalist drive to destroy national sovereignty, would unfailingly be attempted whether Tweedledee or Tweedledum were returned to power. We pointed out that, despite some subsequent shadow-boxing, Harold Wilson as long ago as 1956 welcomed the project as offering opportunities for more controls, more positive Socialist planning measures, and—curious objective for a Socialist—increased investment. That very soon after re-election the Labour Party would renew the campaign for entry was a prediction we felt able to make with absolute assurance.

Nor have events proved us wrong. Last month Wilson openly declared in Parliament that Great Britain's adherence to the Common Market was a task to which the Government would lend all its weight. Questioned about the supranational implications—the strings

attached by the Treaty of Rome—his somewhat too slick reply was a suggestion to the effect that the Treaty's provisions would be honoured more in the breach than in the observance. A week later, no doubt regretting his flippant cynicism, he told Parliament that what he meant was that in judging a written constitution it was more important to examine the way it worked and operated when it became a living institution than to be obsessed by perhaps literal interpretations of the original constitution and its wording—a disingenuous argument which, acted upon, could well prove lethal. Then this audacious hypocrite betook himself to the Lord Mayor's banquet, where he described the Common Market project as "adventure in the grand old style".

* * *

What the Common Market really betokens—other than in the political field—was unconsciously revealed by *The Times* report that "Save and Prosper", Britain's largest unit trust group, is "poised for the leap into Europe." The newspaper's city editor, who in some ways is perhaps a little naïve, declares that the initiative for forming a joint international unit has come from a large European group anxious to benefit from the expertise of the more highly developed unit trust movement in the United Kingdom. If he believes that he will believe anything. It is not the acquisition of expertise that is the objective, but a further giant step towards financial monopoly.

The Times, a trifle obviously, writes: "What makes this approach more important is that it comes against the background of the statement of intent to join the Common Market, and for the first time an American firm of mutual fund managers is interested in the project." I would be inclined to challenge the use of the word "first". However that may be, we perhaps now have a clue as to what Harold Wilson meant when he welcomed the Common Market scheme as providing opportunities for further investment. Once again, it may be for the hundredth time, I quote the words of that percipient genius, the late C. H. Douglas: "The Labour Party is pre-eminently the party of international finance."

* * *

Members of Parliament in Westminster have been asking the Government cheerful questions, such as what measures are being taken to assuage the conditions of the early 'thirties (when the unemployment figures soared towards the three million mark) should they recur in the near future. If there were angry repudiations by Ministers of any such possibility I must have missed reports of them. Instead I formed the impression that there was a less pessimistic, though still lugubrious, disposition on both sides of the House to contemplate the idea of having to cope with an unemployment figure of about 850,000.

Truly we live in wonderful times. Not so long ago Harold Macmillan was stumping the country assuring us that we had "never had it so good". There are still publicists who tell us that we form what they call "The affluent society". Even more curious is the Socialist notion, not seriously disputed by the Conservatives, that national productivity can be increased by

depriving an additional half a million workers or more of the means to produce. Every sensible person understands that human needs and tastes are not a constant, that economic activities must take account of change, in content as well as in technique, and that there must always be in consequence a certain mobility of labour. But while the Government insists that redeployment is the object of its present exercise, it is not of redeployment that the statistics speak, or about which politicians ask their questions, but unemployment. To describe such a system as being cock-eyed is to be unwarrantably generous.

* * *

At this point we shall be met by several arguments. One is that the country is living beyond its means. That is admitted. But when a man lives beyond his means the solution, even on the shortest term, is not that he should cease to live at all except by grace and favour of the Welfare State. Either he must cut back his expenditure or increase his income by increasing his productivity. As the trade unions, which were so necessary at the beginning, have become stubborn to the point of mindlessness, he will certainly not be allowed to cut back his expenditure in the form of temporarily accepting a lower wage (with the possible exception of work-sharing, which is not what the Government wants) and will either have to increase his productivity or, should this be impossible in his own trade, seek another offering better opportunities, which is presumably what the Government wants.

Why, then, did the Government not adopt a redeployment policy, instead of trusting to unemployment to do the dirty work for it? The answer is sure to be that imbalance of payment problems have been endemic in post-war Britain, which is true, and that the severity of the last crisis made it essential to prove at once to the international lending houses that Britain was doing everything in her power to balance her accounts, about the truth of which I am less convinced. In any event, why has the Labour Party never taken one single step to insulate the British economy against the power of international banksterdom?

* * *

Some Labour M.P's., it is true, described the latest measures as being the consequence of a banker's ramp, which charge senior Government spokesmen hastened to rebut. But how genuine is that rebuttal? Let us not forget the Government's injunction to invest in the so-called "underdeveloped" countries—at best a dubious proposition—and its positive discouragement of investment in the White countries of the Commonwealth. Yet in all likelihood the enormous wealth of Australia and Canada—much of it only recently discovered by prospectors—has not been exploited to one-hundredth part of its potential and American interests are pouring money into both countries to make sure that they get in on the ground floor. These facts must be perfectly well-known to the Labour Government, and although national loyalty has more than once been disowned by British Socialism it is scarcely credible that the Government would have warned off British investors as an act

of gratuitous treason. Clearly duress must have been brought to bear by Wall Street as part of the price of "saving the pound".

There are other, more basic factors to be taken into account. Are all human needs satisfied? Of course not. Are raw materials available to supply those needs? To a large extent, yes. Are the human skills available to work upon those raw materials and present them in the shape and form and for the purpose required? To some extent the answer is again yes. How fantastic it is, therefore, that the British Government should feel obliged to initiate a policy leading to large-scale unemployment? How much more than fantastic, how utterly wicked, that those who have power to plunge Governments into such lunacies should be a small gang of manipulators who, by robbing nations of their right to issue credit, have made themselves the masters of mankind through the issue or withholding of tokens of exchange which are not even their own property.

* * *

It is so rarely that a national newspaper espouses a *Candour* theme that I make no apology for quoting at some length from a courageous article contributed by Ronald Sparks to the *Sunday Express*. Examining the reasons why the British Government should enter into any kind of negotiation with Spain over the future status of Gibraltar, he writes: "Today we have to look across the Atlantic for the motivation of the British Government. When Mr. Wilson and his collaborators almost sank our economy, he borrowed American money to bail us out. He is still dependent on United States support for the £. Like any other debtor he has to accept that someone else calls the tune. Thus he destroys fine British aircraft to take in their place inferior American models. Thus he accepts strategic obligations in the Pacific that embarrass his position in his party. No doubt if Mr. Johnson asked him to do a clog dance, poor Mr. Wilson would soon be chubbily clattering through the White House corridors. The Americans have a vital interest in Spain. Their warships use Spanish harbours. From Spanish airfields nuclear-armed U.S. aircraft shield the distant homeland . . . Like everyone else, he [Franco] is aware that Mr. Wilson is in America's pocket. How nice if Mr. Johnson could persuade his little friend to cough up Gibraltar. Then Spain could continue to give America all the facilities she requires."

Mr. Sparks sums up in these true and forthright words: "If the explanation is true, what a terrible price we are paying for Socialist incompetence and weakness. Gibraltar, the key to the Mediterranean, would be only part of that price. For as long as Britain puts her destiny in the hands of a foreign country, for all that time heavy bills will pour in until at the end she will count for about as much in the world as Andorra." Alas, the explanation is only too true. The only mistake Mr. Sparks makes, and this is no doubt attributable to the newspaper's policy, is to place the entire onus for Great Britain's surrender upon the Labour Party. Whereas the Socialists cringe at the Wall-street whip, previous so-called Conservative Governments had only to hear its crack to ensure that they could not be seen for dust.

It has been disclosed that Her Majesty the Queen did send a message of sympathy to Mrs. Verwoerd when the South African Prime Minister was murdered while seated unsuspectingly in his place in Parliament. But it was a private message, the Foreign Office having advised that, as Dr. Verwoerd was not Head of State, official condolences would be out of order. Nothing is less likely than that there would have been the same strict adherence to protocol had the man murdered been, say, the Prime Minister of Australia. However, the fact that Her Majesty did send a message renders unimportant the question of whether it was official or unofficial.

What does matter, and it matters very much indeed, is why all news of the private message was suppressed. The reason in any age but our own would have seemed incredible. There was sitting in London at the time the comic opera outfit known as the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference and it was feared that any knowledge of the Queen's compassion would "anger the delegates." Rather than run this "risk," the contemptible British Government most unjustly allowed Her Majesty to appear before the whole civilized world as an insensitive person, devoid of even the most elementary decency. Had Commonwealth Secretary Bowden not found the Queen's apparent silence embarrassing in his negotiations, the news might have remained suppressed. As the message was private one would have thought that Her Majesty could have insisted on its publication, but she would appear to be resigned to the fact that the Government should be allowed to control not only her public life but also her private life. This is slavery.

The demand continues for

THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS

An exposure of power politics

by A. K. CHESTERTON

10s. 6d. paperback

25s. clothbound

A revised edition is being prepared.

A few copies are still available from
CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

11, Palace Chambers, Bridge Street, London, S.W.1

I have received some illuminating details about the recent opening of the Agricultural College at Malkerns, in Swaziland. The celebrations began with a lavish lunch for 500 guests, followed by drinks in the evening, supper, and then a big ball which began decorously enough but ended with exhibitions of behaviour which were anything but decorous. Earlier in the day a bevy of Swazi maidens provided some light relief. Known as the "Domestic Science Class" they failed with only two exceptions to turn up to prepare the lunch, which had been the task specially allotted to them, with the result that the European wives of senior White Agricultural Officers had to get to work and do the job. Thereupon the twenty one defaulting Swazi maidens were graciously pleased to enjoy the lunch got ready by the officials' wives in their party dresses.

Believe it or not a party of Not Very Important Persons was flown out all the way from England to be present at the opening of the College, for what good purpose (other than their own) nobody seems to know. It has been estimated by reliable observers that the cost of the general junketting must have amounted to at least £2,000. Who was the Fairy Godmother who financed these revels. If my information is correct it was none other than Oxfam. Those who contribute to its funds must be delighted to know that it is so thorough in its relief of famine.

* * *

It is reported that severe cuts are being made in Britain's secret service. As it appears not to have covered itself with glory since the war, the resultant ill-effects upon the national interest may not be calamitous. The difficulty in assessing the position lies in distinguishing between the functions of the various bodies responsible for the provision of intelligence. In addition to the secret service, which is responsible only to the Prime Minister, there are D15, D16, Naval Intelligence, Foreign Office secret agents, and of course our old friends the Special Branch of Scotland Yard.

What we do know is that an absurd amount of time and money is spent, not in keeping Britain's enemies under surveillance, but in maintaining watch and ward over her patriotic organisations. Heaven alone knows why. While we have always enjoyed cordial relations with the Special Branch, and welcome visits from its officers, we have every reason to be incensed when some damn-fool secret outfit embarrasses our friends overseas. Thus a month or two ago the outfit's bone-heads managed to persuade themselves that an attempt was to be made on the life of Harold Wilson, and distributed lists of organisations abroad whom they wished to be interrogated, among them—ludicrous though it be to relate—the Candour League of South Africa, whose organising secretary was duly visited by an officer of Cape Town's C.I.D. There is as much likelihood of the Candour League of South Africa being concerned in a plot against Harold Wilson, or anybody else, as there is of Harold Wilson stealing out of London one dark night to murder the Cham of Tartary. British secret agents who thought otherwise should seek the services of a tip-top veterinary psychiatrist.

A.K.C.

SIR SOLLY IS SO DISARMING!

By **BERNARD SIMMONS**

IT was recently announced that Sir Solly Zuckerman, the zoologist, is to be chairman of a new central advisory committee to co-ordinate all scientific research work controlled by the Council on Scientific Policy, the Advisory Committee on Technology and the Royal Society. A Whitehall expert told a *Daily Mirror* reporter: "This makes Sir Solly Zuckerman the most powerful man British science ever had."

Sir Solly was, in 1959, appointed a member of the new Overseas Research Council, the purpose of which was to co-ordinate assistance given in overseas research by the United Kingdom Research Council, the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, the Medical Research Council and the Agricultural Research Council, together with the formulation of United Kingdom policy thereon.

BASES CLOSED

On the 1st January 1960 Sir Solly succeeded Sir Frederick Brundrett as Chief Scientific Adviser to the Minister of Defence and Chairman of the Defence Research Policy Committee. To what extent the Chief Scientific Adviser and Chairman is actually responsible for advising subsequent defence policy we do not know, but on 1st August, 1962 the Minister of Defence announced that the Thor missile bases in Britain would be closed down in 1963. (These were established under the Anglo-American agreement of 1958, whereby the U.S.A. supplied the missiles.) A few days later the Ministry of Defence announced that the Blue Water surface-to-surface guided missile would be cancelled but "the strike capacity of the R.A.F. will continue to be developed; in particular, the TSR-2 aircraft will be available and will make a powerful contribution both in the conventional and in the nuclear role." (We all know what happened to the TSR-2).

BLUE STREAK ABANDONED

On 11th December, 1962 the U.S. and U.K. defence ministers met in London. Mr. Thorneycroft was supported by Sir Robert Scott, his Permanent Secretary, and by Sir Solly Zuckerman, his Chief Scientific Adviser, and the meeting gave "special attention to the Skybolt missile programme". Under an agreement of 1960 this missile was to be developed by the U.S. Government for the joint use of the U.K. and U.S.A. air forces, and to be carried by the U.K. air force in place of the abandoned Blue Streak. Shortly after the meeting it was announced that the U.S.A. would not supply the Skybolt but instead would make available Polaris missiles *without warheads*. (The same insulting offer was made to France, but the French Minister of Information stated that "France adheres to the principles of her own defence and the independence of her proper defence").

Sir Solly Zuckerman was present at the Moscow talks in August 1963 leading to a treaty between the U.K., the U.S.A., and the U.S.S.R. banning all nuclear

tests except those held underground. Such tests were no longer necessary to the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. but the treaty rendered it impossible for the U.K. to follow the path of France in developing an independent nuclear deterrent.

SOME EXPERIENCE!

In August 1964 Sir Solly was appointed as the British representative on the NATO Defence Research Directors' Committee. In October 1964 his influence still further increased. While retaining his post as Chief Scientific Adviser to the Minister of Defence he also became Scientific Adviser to the Cabinet and adviser to the Foreign Secretary, not on defence but on disarmament, of which he appears to have gained some experience.

In May of this year Sir Solly Zuckerman was promoted to being Chief Scientific Adviser to the Government. The Prime Minister's Office announced that he would be responsible for insuring the co-ordination of the Government's policies for strengthening Britain's scientific and technological resources; would be head of the Government Scientific Service; and would promote the Government's scientific interests abroad in the international field. He would also continue to advise the Foreign Secretary on disarmament. His advice would now be available to *all* Ministers, especially the Minister of Technology.

POWER INCALCULABLE

Sir Solly Zuckerman's power is incalculable. So is his capacity to exercise it. We are not saying that he is not the scientific superbeing which the Government hold him out to be: but we think we have the right to ask the Government for some assurances and explanations. It is a fact that his reign has seen the collapse of our defence potential and its surrender to American control, as well as the loss (mainly to America) of 37 per cent of our physicists who took Ph.D.'s between 1958 and 1963. How much of this is the result of following his advice and how much the result of going against it?

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

The Editor of *Candour* wishes all friends, readers and sympathisers a merry Christmas and purposeful New Year.

Once again Mr. and Mrs. A. K. Chesterton are not sending Christmas cards, as the list contains many hundreds of names of people living all over the world and it is believed that they would prefer the heavy outlay to be devoted to the movement's funds.

The many kindly cards we have already received from them are gratefully acknowledged.

TOWARDS A NATIONAL FRONT

IT is hoped very soon that the formation of a new political organisation, to be named the National Front, will be announced jointly by the League of Empire Loyalists and the British National Party.

Since the annual general meeting of the League which authorised the Policy Directorate to take the initiative in bringing about the formation of a more broadly based organisation to undertake political activity in the United Kingdom, discussions have continued at a number of meetings of the working party consisting of leading members of both organisations. The results of these have been communicated to the League's founder, Mr. A. K. Chesterton, for his comments or approval.

In the November issue of *Candour* it was stated that the tentative title of the new body was the British Independence Party, but that more thought would be given to the matter. The title upon which the working party has now agreed is The National Front. The finally-agreed Objectives are:

(1) To replace what is now known as "The Commonwealth" by a modern British world system which, while ensuring the sovereign independence of each nation, would work for the closest co-operation between the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and Rhodesia, and in which, if they so desired, the Republics of South Africa and Ireland would each occupy an honoured place.

(2) To permit the association with this new world system of approved Afro-Asian countries on terms acceptable to its foundation members.

(3) To achieve for the system adequate economic and agricultural self-sufficiency to make possible the creation of the financial and military strength needed to guarantee its freedom both from Communist domination and from coercion by the power of the international money-lending houses and their financial and political agencies.

ALLIANCES

(4) To seek within non-Communist Europe and elsewhere suitable alliances which would replace involvement in treaty organisations destructive of national sovereignty, and would resist hostile interference by the United Nations and similar organisations.

(5) To give unremitting support to British and other European communities overseas in their maintenance of civilisation in lands threatened with a reversion to barbarism.

(6) To review financial "overseas aid" and other gifts by Britain where there is neither strategical nor political compensation therefor.

(7) To establish in the United Kingdom a Government sufficiently strong and courageous to eradicate the present malaise of liberal internationalism and to imbue the people with a pride in Great Britain's past and faith in her future once the realm has been restored to spiritual health and sanity.

(8) To preserve our British native stock in the United Kingdom, to prevent inter-racial strife such as is seen in the United States of America, and to eradicate race-hatred, by terminating non-white immigration, with

humane and orderly repatriation of non-white immigrants (and their dependants) who have entered since the passing of the British Nationality Act, 1948.

(9) To ensure that just profits, salaries and wages, founded on a fair partnership between employers and employees, are guaranteed by maintaining the principle of private enterprise within a framework of national guidance, wherein employees would be genuinely represented in all matters pertaining to hours, wages and working conditions. Consumer interests would also be represented to ensure protection from monopolistic and other malpractices.

(10) To prevent misuse of the land of Britain.

(11) To encourage home-ownership to give the people a personal stake in their country.

(12) To create a national movement to give guidance for the healthy mental and physical development of British youth.

(13) To adopt all measures necessary to combat crime and to protect police and prison officers in the execution of their duty, and to reverse the tendency to give more consideration to the criminal than to his victims.

ORGANISATION

The working party has also reached general agreement as to the organisational arrangements for the new body, and a detailed Constitution is being worked out. Broadly speaking, the new body will be governed by a Policy Directorate and an Executive Directorate. The Policy Directorate, in addition to its general responsibility for the policy of the new organisation, will also act as a "watchdog" to guard against infiltration by undesirable or irresponsible elements.

Present proposals are that Mr. A. K. Chesterton, M.C., the founder of the League of Empire Loyalists and its Policy Director, should become chairman of the Policy Directorate of the new body, with Mr. Aidan Mackey (L.E.L.) and a representative of the B.N.P. as joint vice-chairmen. A representative of the B.N.P. (probably Mr. Andrew Fountaine, its present President) will be chairman of the Executive Directorate, with another B.N.P. representative and Mr. Austen Brooks (L.E.L.) as joint vice-chairmen. The chairmen and joint vice-chairmen of each Directorate will be *ipso facto* members of the other. Both Directorates will include other leading members of each organisation.

Negotiations having now reached the stage at which it is becoming necessary to compile a joint membership list of L.E.L. and B.N.P. members, it would be appreciated if League members who have not already done so would notify the League office whether or not they wish to be members of the new organisation. Among the questions remaining to be decided by the working party is that of subscription rates and dates when subscriptions will fall due, but in the initial stages paid-up membership of either the League of Empire Loyalists or the British National Party in the United Kingdom will be regarded as membership of the new body unless members expressly state that they do not wish to join it.